

Columbus Redevelopment Commission

Special Board Meeting

November 28, 2016

12:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

1 of 6



Minutes

The Redevelopment Commission met in Special Session on Monday November 28th, 2016 at 12:00 p.m.

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 p.m. by the President.

Attendees:

Commissioners:

☒ Sarah Cannon, Pres. ☒ John Dorenbush, V-P ☒ Don Trapp, Sec.
☒ George Dutro ☒ Robert Abrams ☒ Al Roszczyk

Other attendees:

Heather Pope, Redevelopment Director; and Stan Gamso, counsel.

Action Items:

1. Resolution #28-2016 of the Columbus redevelopment commission to engage the services of a design team for the Riverfront Project – Karen Valiquett, Core Planning

Karen provided a project update. A geomorphic assessment is being conducted by the Indiana Silver Jackets. That study will assess the meandering effects of the stream, sediment sampling and a bathymetric study both up and downstream of the existing dam.

The study will be important when considering the removal of the dam and will be shared with all the other agencies involved in the permitting process.

Columbus Redevelopment Commission

Special Board Meeting

November 28, 2016

12:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

2 of 6



The Indiana Department of Natural Resources has had the enhancement of the East Fork the White River and the removal of this damn on its agenda since June of 2014.

Karen noted that the designers and study groups have suggested either complete removal of the dam or modification of same.

She noted there had been a public information sharing input session held on September 28, 2016. At that meeting a number of options were explored with respect to the riverfront, the dam, public and recreational uses. Concluding that meeting and with public input an RFP was developed and submitted to various design companies.

There were five (5) respondents to the Request For Proposal. Hitchcock Design group provide the most comprehensive package and recommendation both from an economic, public use, and art and aesthetic point of view.

The specific specifications for their service and the project has not been completely identified as result a specific cost is not been established. Howeve, Karen did identify the proposed cost for the services of Hitchcock as being some \$299,000.

George inquired as to the ultimate goals of the project and Karen responded that there were a number of elements it could be included, including but not limited to, a trail component, removal of the dam, development along the west bank. There also safety concerns in that similar low head dams around the state have been attributed to a number of deaths because of the eddies and currents on the upstream side of the dam.

John inquired as to the effect the removal of the dam would have on the boat ramp upstream and Mill rice. Karen surmised that it would not have a substantial effect.

Bob asked when a fee would be established or what the fee range for the various respondents was. Karen provided the general feet range.

She also noted that there had been an interview team involve an identified the participants, Heather, Dave Hayward, Stan, and Jeff Logston.

There was discussion by between the members of the commission as to the cost as were being proposed and the commissioners felt that they did not have enough

Columbus Redevelopment Commission

Special Board Meeting

November 28, 2016

12:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

3 of 6



information to make a decision and would like to have more information regarding the respondents that had been interviewed.

The president then suggested that this matter be tabled until further information could be provided to the commissioners. There was general consensus same.

2. Resolution #29-2016 of the Columbus Redevelopment Commission to approve the capital expenditure for the installation dates for both the Jackson Street parking garage in the second Street parking garage – Heather Pope – Redevelopment Director.

Heather presented a drawing and a summary as had been previously provided by Gary Thompson from REI, the garage management company, and she reminded the commissioners of Gary's comments to them at last Monday's meeting and why there was a need for the gates for the upper levels of both parking garages. Those reasons were prevent loitering, maintain cleanliness, reduce cost of cleanup and to be able close off the upper levels of the parking garage when a snowstorm is impending and thus save cost of filing and shoveling the parking garage during those times.

A motion was made by Don to accept the recommendations of Gary Thompson, REI, to spend no more than \$10,770 for the fabrication and installation of gates for the Second Street and Jackson Street parking garages and to have Ace Welding Company of Columbus Indiana fabricate the gates and install same. John seconded the motion. There was no public input on that and concluding a call for voice vote motion passed unanimously.

3. Resolution #30-2016 of the Columbus redevelopment mission to approve August Mackto conduct a groundwater sampling on the property located at 53 Lafayette Ave – Stan Gamso, Counsel

Counsel presented a summary of the secondhand Lafayette Street remediated property including a graphic illustration of the area that had been remediated as well as conversation he had with the Indiana Department of Environmental Management and the discussion was had regarding future closure of the site.

After the old creosote site had been remediated there had been a number of monitoring wells inserted into the earth. Groundwater sample had been pulled from

Columbus Redevelopment Commission

Special Board Meeting

November 28, 2016

12:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4 of 6



these various wells and the level of creosote and other contaminants in the groundwater have been examined.

The Indiana Department of Environmental Management has requested a complete sampling of all on un-abandoned monitoring wells on the site and on the down gradient property which consists of some 31 monitoring wells. Concluding that sampling they may then direct us to sample certain other wells, a reduced number, to check for groundwater pollution and contamination that would be flowing from this site. They anticipate having samples once a quarter for the 2017 calendar year and then concluding the results of that sampling the Department of Environmental Management may be in a position to discuss ultimate closure of the site and the placement of environmentally restrictive covenants on the property.

Counsel also presented to quotations that he had received one from Bruce Carter and Associates in the amount of some \$34,749 to conduct one round of sampling on all monitoring wells between now and year end and a quotation from August Mack Environmental services in Indianapolis and the amount of \$11,000 to conduct the same groundwater sampling. Counsel was recommending that the Commission move forward with the selection of August Mack.

There was discussion by and between the Commissioners and questions for counsel regarding this project. There were also comments and questions from the public. Concluding closure of the public comment section a motion was made by AI to engage August Mack Environmental services to conduct groundwater sampling all the un-abandoned wells for the some not exceed \$11,000 and said sampling is to be completed on or before December 31, 2016. There being no further discussion John seconded the motion and upon voice vote motion carried unanimously.

4. Amendment to Jayne Farber, independent contractor/consultant contract – Stan Gamso, Counsel

Counsel noted that concluding the previous Redevelopment meeting and after a question have been raised about the description of Jayne Farber's contract, specifically exhibit A he reviewed the exhibit, review the Indiana code and consulted with another redevelopment attorney and concluded that there is nothing specific in the Indiana Code that would require a consultants contract to be tied to a specific project. However the state board of accounts has expressed previous opinions on the topic and they are comfortable having independent contractor work tied to some project specific work. Counsel also pointed out that there's plenty of latitude in the code that would

Columbus Redevelopment Commission

Special Board Meeting

November 28, 2016

12:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

5 of 6



allow for the expenditure redevelopment funds for an independent contractor to meet the needs set forth.

Nonetheless counsel did comment that after review of the code and the recommendations from the State Board of Accounts, he recommended to the redevelopment director that Exhibit A attached to Jayne's contract that was approved the prior week be modified such that the work is more project specific.

The commissioners were presented with a copy of Exhibit A-1 which is a rewritten description of work that Ms. Farber will form and is defined on a project specific basis.

There was discussion by between the Commissioners regarding this recommendation and the matter was open to public comment there were a number of comments setting forth the use of the funds that in the opinion of some of the members of the public the work is not project specific enough and that there should have been a change in the resolution to the fourth Whereas in resolution number 27 – 2016. Commission member Dutro commented that the statement in the whereas is not action item and is merely a statement in support of the overall resolution and he did not see a need to make same changed.

Concluding the close of the discussion counsel recommended that Ms. Farber's contract be amended to remove Exhibit A and replace it with the attached Exhibit A-1, that Exhibit A-1 be modified to include a statement of work involving the railroad project and that the Fourth Whereas in resolution 27 – 2016 be deleted and replaced with "Whereas, the consultant should provide services consistent with Exhibit A-1 of the attached contract for specific work and projects as set forth in that exhibit;"

As to the First recommended Amendment John moved to adopt the recommended amendment and George seconded same upon voice vote an amendment was unanimously approved. As to the second recommended amendment John moved and Al seconded the amendment as articulated by counsel. There being no discussion the amendment was approved unanimously. And as to third recommended Amendment to the fourth paragraph of the Whereas section of resolution 27 – 2016 John moved and Al seconded the motion to adopt that amendment and there being no further discussion and upon unanimous voice vote commitment carried unanimously.

Columbus Redevelopment Commission

Special Board Meeting

November 28, 2016

12:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

6 of 6



Adjournment

There being no further business, John moved and Don seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Approval of ____ day of _____, 2016 minutes.

Sarah Cannon, President

John Dorenbusch, Vice-President

Don Trapp, Secretary

Al Roszczyk, Member

George Dutro, Member

Date: _____